

ROUTLEDGE STUDIES IN LEADERSHIP, WORK
AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Foucault on Leadership

The Leader as Subject

Nathan W. Harter

Foucault on Leadership

The Leader as Subject

Nathan W. Harter

First published 2016
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2016 Taylor & Francis

The right of Nathan W. Harter to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Names: Harter, Nathan, author.

Title: Foucault on leadership : the leader as subject / by Nathan W. Harter.

Description: New York : Routledge, 2016. | Series: Routledge studies in leadership, work and organizational psychology ; 1 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015041207 | ISBN 9781138644595 (hbk)

Subjects: LCSH: Foucault, Michel, 1926–1984. | Leadership—Philosophy.

Classification: LCC HM1261 .H3725 2016 | DDC 303.3/4—dc23

LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015041207>

ISBN: 978-1-138-64459-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-62873-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC



Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

Foucault on Leadership

“Harter has done the heavy lifting for us. He distills the complex work of Michel Foucault on leadership in a way that is both accessible and interesting—and challenging. Foucault—and Harter—urge us to think deeply about our assumptions regarding leadership. This book makes a very valuable contribution to leadership studies, and should be read by all who take the study of leadership seriously.”

—*Michael A. Genovese, Loyola Marymount University, USA*

“Nathan Harter has mined Foucault’s three last lectures to produce a radical rendering of how individuals develop the capacity to lead others with integrity. Accessibly written and illustrated with contemporary examples, this book is essential reading for serious leadership scholars as well as those charged with the ethical development of acting and aspiring leaders.”

—*Donna Ladkin, Plymouth University, UK*

Michel Foucault, one of the most cited scholars in the social sciences, devoted his last three lectures to a study of leader development. Going back to pagan sources, Foucault found a persistent theme in Hellenistic antiquity that, in order to qualify for leadership, a person must undergo processes of subjectivation, which is simply the way that a person becomes a Subject. From this perspective, an aspiring leader first becomes a Subject who happens to lead. These processes depend on a condition of *parresia*, which is truth-telling at great risk that is for the edification of the other person. A leader requires a mentor and advisors in order to lead successfully, while also developing the capacity in one’s own mind to heed the truth. In other words, a leader must learn how to guide oneself.

As a valuable contribution to the field of leadership studies, this book summarizes these last lectures as they pertain to the study and practice of leadership, emphasizing the role of ethics and truth-telling as a check on power. It then presents several other contexts where these same lessons can be seen in practice, including in the life of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, whose career as a writer epitomized speaking truth to power, and somewhat surprisingly in the U.S. military in response to its twenty-first century mission of counterinsurgency.

Nathan W. Harter is Professor of Leadership and American Studies and Director of Interdisciplinary Studies, Christopher Newport University, USA.

**Routledge Studies in Leadership, Work and
Organizational Psychology**

1 Foucault on Leadership

The Leader as Subject

Nathan W. Harter

Preface

A. FIRST, A CONFESSION

For many years, I avoided Foucault's work, in part because his books in particular seemed impenetrable. One expositor admitted that his early works are "not always easy reading. . . ." (Philp, 1985, p. 81) Another alluded to his "tense, impacted prose style. . . ." (C. Geertz, quoted in Macey, 1993, p. 432) In fact, one biographer (whose work was not without some controversy) James Miller used words such as "hermetic [and] bewildering . . . puzzled or confused . . . [and] deeply perplexing." (1993, pp. 124, 210, 293 & 294) Miller wrote, "Like Theseus lost in a maze of forking paths, the reader was often left guessing, uncertain which way to turn . . . baffling." (Miller, 1993, p. 125) Another biographer not only admitted that Foucault's early works were difficult reading but also mentioned their "complexity," "oversubtlety," and "hermetic quality." (Eribon, 1991, p. 122) Foucault even indicated once that for those who expected concrete answers and plain direction on what to do, the confusion in his writings was intentional. (Miller, 1993, p. 235, quoting *Colloqui con Foucault*, 1981; see Macey, 1993, p. 432.)

Making matters worse, Foucault was interested for the longest time in a range of topics that are tangential to leadership at best. Foucault said, "Madness, death, sexuality, crime—these are the subjects that attract most of my attention." (Miller, 1993, p. 158, quoting from an interview published in *L'Express* in 1984) One characterization of Foucault's broader interest had been some kind of disintegration of the self, from without and within. (Miller, 1993, p. 248, quoting Wade, *Foucault in California*) Foucault believed that the idea of an "identity" is either an illusion or simply boring. (Miller, 1993, p. 256, quoting an interview published in *The Advocate* in 1984; see also Miller, 1993, p. 258, quoting an interview published in *Gai Pied* in 1981) And in order to transgress the norms of modern society, he considered it important to experience these disintegrations for himself—activities such as drug use, sadomasochism, and rebellion—which he did with gusto for many years, apparently to escape his "self," or in his words, to desubjectify and affirm a nonidentity. (Miller, 1993, p. 264) All of this language can seem remote from the conventional treatment of leader

development, if not hostile to the very idea, so for the longest time I had little reason to study Foucault.

To top it all off, I am both a Christian and a conservative. Foucault represents so much that I was meant to oppose. Mentors and ideological allies put me on my guard when it came to this French intellectual who is often caricatured as chic, impossibly clever, and dreadfully wrong about a lot of things. Yet here I am writing a book based on his work. Why is that? The answer begins with the fact that in his last years, Michel Foucault delivered a series of lectures explicitly about leadership, which is my chosen field of study. These lectures are more accessible to someone like me than his books ever were. And at this stage in his life, he was bending away perceptibly from some of the implications of his earlier beliefs, just as I too am bending toward a kind of rapprochement.

In short, I had originally found Foucault difficult to understand on topics tangential to the study of leadership. In addition, I had been persuaded for years to regard Foucault as an ideological foe. All of that changed when I began reading his 1982 lectures on Plato's *Alcibiades I*.

Before going much further into the content of those late researches, we should consider what is meant by leader development.

B. LEADER DEVELOPMENT, *PAIDEIA*, AND *BILDUNG*

Programs of leader development—and especially those in academic settings—aim to help students acquire the knowledge, skills, and ability to understand and participate responsibly in the leadership process. As David Day has put it, leader development focuses on “the development of individuals (leaders) . . . building individual capabilities.” (2011, p. 38) Although formal programs explicitly designed for leader development are relatively recent in academe, the problems these programs were designed to address are very old. In fact, they are perennial. The historical record demonstrates that intentional preparation of young adults for leadership has been undertaken for centuries in just about every culture—in religious communities, for instance, and in the military. This preparation is a ritual process to be undertaken before one is equipped to lead.

Just to pick an example from the remote past, Homer recounted the role of Nestor (*Iliad*) and Mentor (*Odyssey*), elders chosen to develop prospective leaders. (Mentor was even portrayed as a representation of Athena in human form.) We now use Mentor's name to designate this developmental activity. A more complete account of the ancient Greek ideal for education appears in the seminal work by Werner Jaeger titled *Paideia*. (1933/1945)¹ This developmental enterprise has been regarded ever since as a “supremely human task and privilege . . . central to civilization . . .” (Park, 1984, p. 153) The logic is fairly simple. As José Ortega y Gasset once pointed out, “In every society someone governs, whether a group or a class, few people or

many.” (1930/1944, p. 39) He went on to state, “It is of the first importance to these societies [that its leaders] possess the power to make their lives a vital influence. . . .” (1930/1944, p. 40) Leader development is one way to characterize this perennial project of replacing a generation of leaders.

From a broader perspective, leader development is not exclusively about preparing young men and women literally to govern other people and therefore dominate as an elite. Manning Marable once exhorted his African-American readers in 1990 to raise up leaders for an oppressed people *in opposition* to those who govern. He sought creative young people and successful older adults to come together and establish what he called “freedom schools” to supplement the official public school curriculum, i.e. providing internships for African-Americans, mentorships, and specialized training in leadership. (1990/1993, ch. 16) So it is not the case that leader development exists exclusively to identify and set aside an elite, preparing the happy few “to control and exploit others in support of [their] hierarchy [and] enable coercion, force, and exploitation.” (Laudeman, 2012, p. 43) Which is not to say this doesn’t happen, but the aspiration has been to be proactive about bringing adolescents into responsible positions throughout the community, to make active and independent subjects of them. In the absence of which (to paraphrase the historian Leopold von Ranke), every generation is equidistant from barbarism.

The German Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835) shared his concern that adequate education was entirely lacking or had become the preserve of a select few. It was his contention that what he called *Bildung* be “powerfully and universally propagated”—not just for the sake of perpetuating civilization as it has been, but of elevating it further. (Lüth, 2000, p. 59) In addition to serving the purposes of civilization, *Bildung* would serve the fulfillment of individual striving as well, inasmuch as these twin purposes are one and the same. What improves the individual, in his opinion, makes possible the improvement of civilization. (Lüth, 1967/2000, p. 67) Leader development as it is presently understood serves both (a) the student as an individual emerging into adulthood and (b) the community he or she comes to serve. What’s good for the goose is good for the gaggle. Whether this belief in a dual or mutual benefit is true or not, it supports the enterprise of leader development.

The actual process of leader development entails something called “liminality” or “the liminal.” Because this concept of liminality will play a part in the argument of my book later, we should consider it briefly here.

C. THE CONCEPT OF LIMINALITY

The process known as leader development entails bringing someone through stages from adolescence into adulthood. As the anthropologists have taught us, cultures usually sponsor rites and rituals intended to guide young people

along the way, and these episodes are supposed to introduce a discontinuity into his or her life, a shift in one's identity that can seem liberating and terrifying at the same time. This transitional or in-between phase from one state or condition to another has become known in the literature as liminality. (Thomassen, 2014; van Gennep, 2004) One might say it has become the purpose of leader development to induce and then guide the prospective leader through a liminal phase—to the extent this doesn't happen ad hoc to young people anyway in the form of adversity and “crucible” moments. (see Bennis & Thomas, 2002)²

For purposes of clarification, it is more than simply saying that liminality is the phase between stages of life, after letting go of the past and before grabbing hold of the future. If anything, it is both/and: i.e. a mingling or blurring of both past and future. More importantly, liminality for leadership is preparation for a lifetime of entering, tolerating, and exploiting the experience of liminality. Leaders must become familiar with liminality. Leaders are the ones who recognize the potential of liminality—its creative or generative function in life—so that they can induce and guide others to consider the world as being otherwise, i.e. better. Leaders gird themselves for the experience of liminality and even seek it out, over and over, for themselves and others, because on the far side of the disorientation and discomfort that comes with liminality can be the realization of a vision and the fulfillment of a dream.

One sees already in the literature that prospective leaders are being prepared for a reality that plainly conduces to liminality. Writing in 2002, for example, Judith Stiehm explained the U.S. military's interest in preparing future commanders for conditions labeled as VUCA, which is an acronym that stands for Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, and Ambiguous. It is hard to imagine a more succinct description of liminality. If in fact leader development expects to prepare prospective leaders for the reality within which they will be expected to function, then much depends on the characterization of reality they take with them. VUCA describes episodes where leadership is most acutely desired.

In the spirit of Peter Vaill (1989), perhaps we should consider the possibility that all of reality is VUCA. Perhaps stability, certainty, simplicity, and disambiguation are illusions. (Harter, 2006, p. 92) Our existence often seems inherently tensional, betwixt and between, a space in which we orient ourselves by the cardinal directions for our convenience and not because there is in actual fact an East or West. We operate according to boundaries that aren't as strict as we might suppose (see e.g. Bauman, 2007; Bergson, 1946/2007; Kosko, 1993; Tillich, 1966; Wilber, 2001), which is precisely what the etymology of the term “liminal” implies: namely, that threshold, gateway, or point of breach in what had been perceived as a solid border. Liminality comes with passages, between ports on the open sea, crossing over, penetrating barriers. And if paramount reality is not so neatly differentiated as our minds apparently need it to be, then perhaps every moment is liminal. Life itself is liminal.

In a manner of speaking, at some level, leaders perceive this creative possibility; nevertheless, they must also communicate with followers, in the language of Kurt Lewin (1951), that we transit from one state or condition of relative stability to another. That is to say, in a world of liminality, leaders induce passage from point A to point B, even though in actuality there is no end to the process. Humans move from A to B and then to C, D, E, F, G, H, and so on. Leader development therefore means preparing prospective leaders for the “fuzziness” within which they will be asked to operate en route to an indefinite future.

Not long ago, Randall White and Sandra Shullman (2010) said it all: acceptance of uncertainty is an indicator of effective leadership.

Liminality itself is a very old problem, or at least a very old and formative experience, recounted in Homer’s *Odyssey* and in the *Exodus* of Moses. Yet liminality is more than a journey. It is a kind of space suspended between two points; that is, from the inside (i.e. as it is experienced), without the usual points of reference; it is a disorienting and whirling confusion of everything and anything in shades of gray, akin to symptoms of anxiety, and not unlike Newtonian space that is infinite in every direction.

The pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus tried to warn his reader that despite our perceptions, day and night and all things are one, and every day the same, so that all things abide in some hidden attunement, even though nothing is stable—“it scatters and again gathers, it forms and dissolves, and approaches and departs.” (Kahn, 1979, fragments XIX, XX, XXXVI, LXXX) Not dissimilar from these texts are the accounts of mystics in various religious contexts, where they claim ecstasies about being caught up in some enveloping union that defies differentiation and specificity. It is almost as though in such moments, one reverts to that primordial condition described so vividly by William James as “one big blooming buzzing Confusion” (1948, p. 16)—an encounter with reality that is unmediated by discernment and category, which the philosopher might describe simply as Being. The maturing human mind increasingly resists the experience of liminality or (in a manner of speaking) holds it at arm’s length in order to make sense of it, to remember it, to express it aloud to others, to recognize one’s self in relationship with it. Otherwise, the experience makes us uncomfortable or worse. Charles Sanders Peirce (1877) explained this discomfort in a classic essay written many years ago as a spur to critical thinking.

If this “liminality” is the condition for leadership, how then does one navigate? Why even bother? What Foucault had been diagnosing earlier in his career was the development of elaborate power structures that arguably make liminality and leadership unnecessary and unlikely. These power structures were becoming veritable “substitutes for leadership,” as described later by Gary Yukl (2013, p. 165). Once certain power structures were in place, leadership as we usually mean the term would be superfluous. And then followers could avoid the unpleasant experience of liminality (and thus have no reason to seek out leaders) if only they would submit themselves to

the prevailing power structures. No liminality, no leadership. It was a trend foreseen already by Max Weber (1921/1947), who had been describing the closing of an “iron cage” around our social lives. Foucault had spent his earlier career looking around at the evidence.

D. LIMIT-EXPERIENCES AND THE TURNING

Because of Foucault's belief about the emergence of these encompassing power structures, as though we are living in a vast, totalitarian dystopia, he was especially interested before 1982 in what he referred to as limit-experiences, i.e. activity at the extreme, in contravention of norms, and even in violation of common sense. There just might be, he suspected, a considerable freedom in madness and crime and perversion. These activities cross boundaries, expressing a desire to evade detection and control. There is a kind of secret thrill to the possibility of eluding these systems, of sneaking away to indulge forbidden appetites and entertain fugitive thoughts. Perhaps what society forbids or treats as a taboo is essentially liberating. For many years, Foucault dedicated himself with *frisson* to exploring these dark topics. By doing so, in both his personal life and his work, Foucault's “intention [was] to throw our assumptions and certainties into question.” (Philp, 1985, p. 79) He had been using forms of resistance against the prevailing forms of power as a kind of “chemical catalyst [in his words] so as to bring to light power relations, locate their position, find out their point of application and the methods used.” (1982/1983, p. 211) What he was exploring in his own way was the incidence of liminality. In a world that is dedicated to eradicating the experience of liminality, perhaps freedom lies in transgression.

By the 1960s, Foucault's fascination with “limit-experience” went beyond doing book research. With the so-called baby boomers taking it to the street, he had discovered revolutionary politics. (e.g. Miller, 1993, p. 170f; see generally Macey, 1993) At that time, this meant he associated with the radical left, especially a kind of Maoism in Europe that was becoming both chic and violent.³

After flirting with political violence and even terrorism, however, around 1973, Foucault “pulled back and quietly began to rethink his position. . . . [H]e would eventually express open skepticism about the ‘very desirability of the revolution.’” (Miller, 1993, p. 233, citing a 1977 interview in *Le Nouvel Observateur* titled “Foucault: non au sexe roi”) After years of political leftism, he slowly swung toward becoming anti-Marxist. (Miller, 1993, p. 58, citing *Colloqui con Foucault*⁴) Later in life, he would become in Didier Eribon's words “violently anticommunist.” (1991, p. 136) By 1979, he was even expecting that students read libertarian stalwarts, such as Ludwig von Mises and Frederick Hayek! (Miller, 1993, p. 310, citing an anonymous interview from 1990⁵) His biographer James Miller referred to his turn as “political self-renunciation.” (1993, p. 297) This ostensibly political turn was only part of a deeper shift in his thinking.

Even before 1976, for instance, Foucault had been “lamenting the inadequacy of his work to date.” (Miller, 1993, p. 285; cf. Philp, 1985, p. 68) To the consternation of erstwhile allies, he was changing direction and modifying his path. (Miller, 1993, p. 287, citing as one example Deleuze, 1990) For this phase, he chose solitude in order to reexamine his work, and the questions he came to address would now look more familiar to scholars in leadership: “How to govern oneself, how to be governed, how to govern others, how to accept the one who is to govern us, how to become the best possible governor, etc.” (Miller, 1993, p. 299, quoting Foucault’s 1979 *Tanner Lectures on Human Values*)

When writing about power, it was not just *state* power that had interested him; in the early 1980s, he was developing a more expansive notion of interpersonal power in which even just one person—regardless of official status—influences the actions of another. (Philp, 1985, p. 74) Here is a scenario remarkably close to definitions used in leadership studies. (see Rost, 1991/1993) In short, Foucault had always been interested in the macro phenomena of power structures, as we have just seen, as well as in the micro phenomena of leadership. Now, however, leading up to his last lectures in 1982–84, his thinking about such topics shifted noticeably.

Not only were the questions he was asking different from the ones that had interested him in public before, there was a different style to his manner of expression. Toward the end, his style became “sharply different . . . limpid, sober, and serene. . . .” (Miller, 1993, p. 34; see also Eribon, 1991, p. 331) David Macey calls his newer writing style “plain.” (1993, p. 467) Eric Paras uses words such as “calm . . . placid . . . slow [and] deliberate. . . .” (2006, p. 13) Gilles Barbedette and Andre Scala mentioned to Foucault during a late interview that, “What strikes the reader of your last books is the writing—clear, pure, smooth, and very different from your habitual style.” (1996, p. 465) And Foucault agreed.

It was, as Miller notes, an inward turn, a turn toward his own liminal experiences with ancient texts and what they implied. (1993, p. 326) Experts in the academy at that time questioned his competence to handle the ancient materials (perhaps with some justification), and his ideological allies expressed alarm at the direction these studies were taking. (Miller, 1993, p. 326) Nevertheless, Foucault immersed himself in Greek and Latin antiquity, especially the first and second century, for an experience that plainly accompanied a change in his worldview.

The lectures that Foucault delivered at the Collège de France from 1981–84 laid out his latest research—work that would unfortunately never appear in the form of a book. (Gros, 2008, pp. 377 & 386) These lectures built upon each other, almost as though they belong to a single chain with slightly different links, different aspects of the same topic. One commentator notes that “there is the very strong impression of being present at the gestation of a line of research. . . .” (Gros, 2008, p. 384)

This turn in Foucault’s thinking explicitly addresses leadership, which is why scholars in leadership studies ought to consider them.

NOTES

1. Foucault had completed pages on the topic of “paideia” at the time he was working on these last lectures, but they were never delivered during the lectures and also never found their way into print. (Gros, 2001, p. 517) Nevertheless, this fact alone hints at the possible relevance of the topic to his research.
2. Looking ahead to Foucault’s lectures, we might say that for him the problem is that modernity has done a poor job with conducting young people through rituals of liminality. (see Szokolczai, 1998, pp. 24–25)
3. Didier Eribon quotes from an interview in which Foucault admitted that his brief flirtation with the Communist Party in the 1950s had forced him to stand behind facts that were by no means even plausible, and he did so because he thought that by doing so he would achieve what he called “ego dissolution.” (1991, p. 56, quoting Trombadori, 1981) Foucault had joined the party in his youth, although he was never a Stalinist, and he quit altogether by 1953, turning his back on Marxism two years later. (Eribon, 1991, pp. 33 & 53–57) Eric Paras points out that for a few years, Foucault resurrected some of the language of Marxism in the wake of his involvement in leftist politics after 1968, but then he set it aside again for good after 1973. (2006, pp. 60 & 62)
4. Macey complicates this judgment a bit, noting that although at one point Foucault had joined the Communists and migrated toward working alongside Maoists, Foucault never claimed to have been Marxist himself. (Macey, 1993, p. 196) In any case, by 1977, Foucault’s “‘leftist’ period was over, his disillusionment with Marxism was complete” (Macey, 1993, p. 388) What took its place as his political ideology is still being debated to this day. (e.g. Behrent, 2009; Zamora, 2014)
5. This is not to suggest that Foucault endorsed their neoliberal positions. Still, he found much of value for his own purposes. See especially his *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979* (2004), a translation into English, which was published in 2010.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid times: Living in an age of uncertainty*. Polity.
- Behrent, M. (2009). “Liberalism without humanism: Michel Foucault and the Free-Market Creed, 1976–1979.” *Modern Intellectual History*. 6(3): 539–568.
- Bennis, W. & R.J. Thomas. (2002). *Geeks and geezers: How era, values, and defining moments shape leaders*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Bergson, H. (1946/2007). *The creative mind: An introduction to metaphysics*. Dover.
- Day, D. “Leadership development.” In Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. & M. Uhl-Bien (eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of leadership* (ch. 4). Sage.
- Eribon, D. (1991). *Michel Foucault* (B. Wing, trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. “Afterword (L. Sawyer, trans.).” In Dreyfuss, H. & P. Rabinow (eds.). (1982/1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed.) (pp. 208–226). University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1996). *Foucault live: Interviews, 1961–1984* (L. Hochroth & J. Johnston, trans.). Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (2004/2010). *The Birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979* (G. Burchell, trans.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gros, F. “Course context.” In Foucault, M. (ed.). (2001). *The hermeneutics of the subject: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1981–82* (pp. 507–550). Picador.
- Gros, F. “Course context.” In Foucault, M. (ed.). (2008). *The government of self and others: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1982–83* (pp. 377–391). Picador.

- Harter, N. (2006). *Clearings in the forest: On the study of leadership*. Purdue University Press.
- Jaeger, W. (1933/1945). *Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture* (2nd ed.)(vol. 1)(G. Highet, trans.). Oxford University Press.
- James, W. (1948). *Psychology*. The World Publishing Company.
- Kahn, C. (1979). *The art and thought of Heraclitus: An edition of the fragments with translation and commentary*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kosko, B. (1993). *Fuzzy thinking: The new science of fuzzy logic*. Hyperion.
- Laudeman, G. "Leading learnership: The transformation of leadership via convergence with learning." In Barbour, J., Burgess, G., Falkman, L. & R. McManus (eds.). (2012). *Leading in complex worlds [Building leadership bridges]* (ch. 4). Jossey-Bass.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. Harper & Row.
- Lüth, C. "On Wilhelm von Humboldt's theory of *Bildung* (G. Horton-Krüger, trans.)." In Westbury, I., Hopmann, S. & K. Riquarts (eds.). (2000). *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition* (ch. 4). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Macey, D. (1993). *The lives of Michele Foucault: A biography*. Pantheon Books.
- Marable, M. "Where are our future leaders?" In Rosenbach, W. & R. Taylor (eds.). (1990/1993). *Contemporary issues in leadership* (3rd ed.)(ch. 16). Westview Press.
- Miller, J. (1993). *The passion of Michel Foucault*. Simon & Schuster.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1930/1944). *Mission of the university* (H. Nostrand, trans.). W. W. Norton & Co.
- Paras, E. (2006). *Foucault 2.0: Beyond power and knowledge*. Other Press.
- Park, C. (1984, Spring/Summer). "A reconsideration: Werner Jaeger's *Paideia*." *Modern Age*. 28(2-3): 152-155.
- Peirce, C.S. (1877, November). "The fixation of belief." *Popular Science Monthly*. 12(1): 1-15.
- Philp, M. "Michel Foucault." In Skinner, Q. (ed.). (1985). *The return of grand theory in the human sciences* (ch. 4). Cambridge University Press.
- Rost, J. (1991/1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Praeger.
- Stiehm, J.H. (2002, June). *The U.S. Army War College: Military education in a democracy*. Temple University Press.
- Szokolczai, A. (1998). *Max Weber and Michel Foucault: Parallel life-works*. Routledge.
- Thomassen, B. (2014). *Liminality and the modern: Living through the in-between*. Ashgate.
- Tillich, P. (1966). *On the boundary: An autobiographical sketch*. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Vaill, P. (1989). *Managing as a performing art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change*. Jossey-Bass.
- van Gennep, A. (2004). *The rites of passage* [Routledge library editions: Anthropology and ethnography]. Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1921/1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (T. Parsons, ed.; T. Parsons & A.M. Henderson, trans.). Free Press.
- White, R. & Shullman, S. (2010). "Acceptance of uncertainty as an indicator of effective leadership." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*. 62(2): 94-104.
- Wilber, K. (2001). *No boundary: Eastern and Western approaches to personal growth*. Shambhala.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Zamora, D. (2014, December 10). "Can we criticize Foucault?" *Jacobin*. Retrieved 29 December 2014 from <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2014/12/foucault-interview/>.

Acknowledgments

Nothing that I do, do I do alone. And a good thing, too.

First, I thank the faculty, administration, and staff at Christopher Newport University for their collegiality and hospitality since 2011. My wife and I have been welcomed into this incredible community and are the better for it.

Second, I have conducted a private study group (PSG) in my home for several years, where thoughtful undergraduates have shared dessert and conversations about this material in particular and other themes pertaining to leadership. These contributions are impossible to attribute to any one person, so I acknowledge them all, because many of the thoughts and ideas that appear in this book first arose in their hearing. I do want to single out the following participants for actually writing helpful comments about the manuscript itself: Dagny Palmer, Matt Rutherford, Jefferson Schleifer, Hayley Struzik, and Oliver Thomas.

In one way or another, the following persons offered advice, encouragement, and administrative support. I owe them a debt I can never repay. The least I can do is mention them here by name: Bob Colvin, Brent Cushner, Michael Harvey, Christopher Loy, Ken Otter, Benjamin Redekop, Lynn Shollen, Colonel Gerard Tertychny, Qingyan Tian, Colonel Thomas Williams—not to mention the competent and pleasant staff at Routledge, as well as everyone who worked with me to conduct a webinar on the topic for the International Leadership Association in August 2015. Elizabeth Wall did some important transcription work for me as well: thank you, Lizzy! Having made these acknowledgments I must add that whatever flaws or defects appear in the argument of this book are solely my responsibility.

This book is dedicated to my accomplished siblings, living or deceased, in order of their appearance: Abie, Mary, Bimbo, Rachel, Susanna, Bill, and John. I am and always have been proud to be a member of Anderson, Indiana's inaugural "Family of the Year." You have each made contributions to your professions (education, law, medicine, ministry, and scholarship in economics and statistics), in your neighborhoods and families, and among your friends, setting an example for me, whether or not I ever said so aloud.

To God be all the glory. And to Karin, as ever, my heart.

Contents

| | |
|--|---------|
| <i>Preface</i> | vii |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | xvii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1 1981–82 | 14 |
| 2 1982–83 | 34 |
| 3 1983–84 | 53 |
| 4 Parresia in the Twentieth Century: Solzhenitsyn | 69 |
| 5 Subjectivation in the Twenty-First Century: The U.S. Military | 79 |
| 6 Closing the Distance | 97 |
| <i>Index</i> | 117 |

Introduction

A. FOUCAULT'S RESEARCH

The purpose of this book is fairly narrow. It introduces the last three lecture series of the eminent scholar Michel Foucault, as they can be said to pertain to leader development. Here we will rely most on the English translations of these recorded lectures, with only a few references to other lectures and interviews he would have given during the same span of years (i.e. 1982–84).¹

Foucault left clear instructions that there should be no posthumous publication of his writings that he had not published in his lifetime. His estate has obeyed, with one major qualification. Foucault is deemed to have published lectures that he allowed to be taped.

(Gutting, 2013)²

This was the case for the last three lectures series, despite the fact that these lectures were in fact substantially written out ahead of time and available in manuscript to his executors. (Gros, 2001, p. 545)

With few exceptions, I see little reason to spend much time trying to summarize the intricate and groundbreaking work Foucault did before these lectures—that is, before 1982. Others have been studying that material for years; Michel Foucault (me-SHELL foo-COE) is, after all, the most cited scholar in the social sciences. Eventually, I will give a brief sketch of this important work as background, but that is all. Neither will I attempt a biography of Foucault. That's been done, too. (see Eribon, 1991; Macey, 1993; Miller, 1993) With regard to the lectures that I want to talk about, I am in no position to judge many aspects, such as the felicity of the translations from the original French by Graham Burchell (to whom many thanks are due). The question that animates my book centers on one thing: i.e. Foucault's treatment of leadership, in the broadest sense of the term. I find that having drawn the purpose this narrowly still leaves us plenty to talk about.

One way to begin framing the inquiry that consumed his last years is that Foucault was at this time especially interested in Greek and Roman antiquity, ranging from the era of Pericles to the rise of the Christian church in Europe under Justinian—a period of roughly a thousand years. For convenience,